

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 22 2008

REMARKS

Claim 1 is amended. Claims 1-18, as amended, remain in the application. No new matter is added by the amendments to the claims.

The Rejections:

In the Office Action dated October 22, 2007, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Svensson-Hilford et al (US 6,354,405 B1).

Referring to Claim 1, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford teaches a method for security checking or transport of persons by an elevator installation comprising the steps of:

generating at least one authentication signal associated with a person seeking to use the elevator installation (column 2, line 66 through column 3, line 4 of Svensson-Hilford);

detecting the at least one authentication signal with a mobile authentication device (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-35 of Svensson-Hilford);

checking the at least one authentication signal with at least one person reference (column 4, lines 28-35 of Svensson-Hilford);

in the case of correspondence of the authentication signal and the person reference, providing at least one identification code (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-35 of Svensson-Hilford);

detecting the at least one identification code with a stationary recognition device of the elevator installation (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-35 of Svensson-Hilford); and

assigning to the identification code one of a predefined travel destination and an input travel destination input at the recognition device by the person (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-35 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 2, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches including supplying the authentication device with electrical power from at least one energy source external to the authentication device (column 2, lines 30-40 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 3, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches including selecting as the authentication signal a biometric signal being one of a fingerprint, a hand geometry, a facial profile, an iris pattern, a retinal scan, a thermogram, a smell, a voice, a signature and pressing of a button (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-35 of Svensson-Hilford).

16715

Referring to Claim 4, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches including checking whether at least one user reference exists for the detected identification code (column 4, lines 28-35 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 5, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches including comparing the input travel destination with at least one access authorization for generating one of a control signal and an alarm signal (column 4, lines 28-44 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 6, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches including comparing the input travel destination with a list of travel destinations of an access authorization for generating one of a control signal and an alarm signal (column 4, lines 28-65 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 7, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford teaches a system for security checking or transport of persons by an elevator installation comprising:

- a mobile authentication device adapted to be carried by a person, said authentication device detecting an authentication signal of the person and checking whether said authentication signal corresponds with a person reference, said authentication device generating an identification code when said authentication signal corresponds to said person reference (column 2, line 66 through column 3, line 4; column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-35 of Svensson-Hilford);

- a stationary recognition device of the elevator installation for detecting said identification code (column 2, line 66 through column 3, line 4 of Svensson-Hilford); and

- a checking device connected to said recognition device for assigning to said identification code one of a predefined travel destination and an input travel destination input at said recognition device by the person to generate a control signal for the elevator installation (column 3, line 55 through column 4, line 35 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 8, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches wherein said authentication device includes a sensor for generating said authentication signal in the presence of the person (column 2, lines 35-40 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 9, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches wherein said sensor is a camera for detecting at least one of a fingerprint, a hand geometry, a facial profile, an iris profile, a retinal scan and a signature of the person (column 2, lines 35-40; column 4, lines 28-35 of Svensson-Hilford).

16715

Referring to Claim 10, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches wherein said sensor is one of a thermal camera for detecting a thermogram of the person, a smell sensor for detecting a smell of the person, a microphone for detecting a voice of the person, and a button for detecting pressing of the button by the person (column 2, lines 35-40; column 4, lines 28-35 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 11, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches wherein said authentication device is adapted to be powered by an external energy source (column 2, lines 30-40 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 12, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches wherein said authentication device includes a transmitting and receiving unit and said recognition device includes a transmitting and receiving unit for communicating said identification code (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-35 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 13, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches wherein said authentication device includes a data store for storing said person reference and compares said person reference with said authentication signal to generate said identification code (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-44 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 14, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches wherein said authentication device includes a data store for storing said identification code prior to detecting said authentication signal (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-44 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 15, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches wherein said recognition device includes input means for receiving said input travel destination from the person (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-35 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 16, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches wherein said checking device includes a data store for storing said predefined travel destination (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-44 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 17, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches wherein said checking device includes a data store for storing a user reference and compares said user reference with said identification code to generate said control signal (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-44 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 18, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches wherein said checking device includes a data store for storing an access authorization and compares said access authorization with one of said predefined travel destination and said input travel destination to generate said control signal (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-44 of Svensson-Hilford).

The Response:

The claimed invention relates to a method for a double security check in front of an elevator installation. For doing so, the person to be checked carries a mobile authentication device similar to a credit card and which may comprise a sensor, a processor and a memory with a person reference. The person to be checked performs a first authentication test by taking a biometric signal with the sensor, the processor compares the biometric signal with the person reference and issues an identification code if the authentication test is positive. The identification code is an RF signal which is detected by a stationary recognition device of the elevator installation. The elevator installation comprises a processor and a memory with a user reference. The processor compares the identification code with the user reference. If this second identification test is positive, a control signal is issued to an elevator control in order to transport the person to a travel destination.

Applicants amended Claim 1 to clarify that the authentication device performs steps c) and d) as recited in original Claim 7.

The only mobile device disclosed in Svensson-Hilford is the card or the transmitter/receiver system with individual data which is read into or received by the identification device (c.4, 1.6-8). Neither the card nor the transmitter/receiver system performs the following steps recited in amended Claim 1:

- b) detecting the authentication signal associated with the person seeking to use the elevator;
- c) checking the authentication signal with at person reference; and
- d) providing an identification code in the case of correspondence of the authentication signal and the person reference.

Rather the Svensson-Hilford card or the transmitter/receiver system merely transmits individual data to the identification device 15 (there is no authentication of the user whatsoever). Furthermore, the identification devices 15 are fixed on the floors and in the elevator car. (Col. 2, Lines 65-67; Figs. 1 and 2)

The alternatives to the card or the transmitter/receiver identification system, mentioned in Svensson-Hilford, are to either type in an access code via the trip destination input device 14 or through the use of a biometric system (Col. 4, Lines 28-35). However, at Col. 2, Lines 53-55 Svensson-Hilford explicitly states that the trip destination input devices 14 are fixed on each of the floors E0, E1 and E2 and, without an explicit teaching to the contrary, it is assumed that the biometric system is also fixed on each of the floors. Accordingly, these stationary alternatives do not provide Applicants' step of: b) detecting the authentication signal with a mobile authentication device.

Accordingly, Applicants' independent Claims 1 (method) and 7 (system) are clearly not anticipated by Svensson-Hilford.

From the passages quoted by the Examiner from Svensson-Hilford in support of his objection against Claim 1 (Col. 4, Lines 6-14 and Lines 28-35), Applicants formed the impression that the Examiner views the systems of the two cited passages as complimentary rather than alternative. This is clearly not the case since at Col. 4, Lines 28-35, Svensson-Hilford introduces the second alternative and then states that after identification, the calculation, authorization, and charging then take place in the same way as for the card with individual data for the transmitter/receiver system of the first alternative. Therefore, the Examiner's apparent combination of features from the two alternatives is not permissible.

Although no detailed objections have been raised at this stage in relation to Gazdzinski, the Examiner stated that "Claims 1-18 of the instant application also read on by Gazdzinski's prior art."

Gazdzinski describes a first embodiment having a speech recognition system and other input device such as a touch pad. The user utilizes the input device to activate the system, and then speaks the name of the firm or individual whose location is desired. A speech generation algorithm and processor generates speech (and/or a graphical representation via a minimum profile flat panel display) based on data retrieved from a database per the user's request. The user

16715

is also prompted to determine if he/she desires to select the floor of the firm or individual that he/she is trying to locate. The user then may use the speech recognition system, or alternatively the aforementioned input device, to respond. (Col.3, Lines 4-18)

This first embodiment does not include a mobile authentication device and does not identify (let alone authenticate) the user as recited in Applicants' claims. Instead, Gazdzinski permits the unidentified user to enter travel requests either vocally or by manual manipulation via a stationary/fixed speech recognition system or input device, respectively.

The only other embodiment of Gazdzinski describing an alternative is the sixth embodiment which is summarized at Col.4, Lines 5-20. Here the user carries a conventional RFID tag and when it comes within range of an associated stationary reader, the reader interrogates the RFID tag which then transmits an ID signal to the reader. Although the RFID tag is obviously a mobile device, it clearly does not carry out any authentication of the user as defined in steps a) to e) of Applicants' Claim 1 or in Applicants' Claim 7.

Accordingly, Applicants' independent claims are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the teaching of Gazdzinski.

The Examiner stated that the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. The Examiner cited Gazdzinski (US 6,615,175 B1) that discloses "smart" elevator system and method (see Title). Claims 1-18 of the instant application also read on by Gazdzinski's prior art. Applicants reviewed this reference and found it to be no more pertinent than the prior art relied upon by the Examiner in the rejections.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the above arguments, Applicants believe that the claims of record now define patentable subject matter over the art of record. Accordingly, an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.